

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 23 is amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments or the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter); and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

A. The Office Action rejects claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully submit that a notebook computer is described as an exemplary computer system or would be known as the same to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the application was filed. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 2 provides a written description of an exemplary notebook computer to which embodiments of the present invention can be applied.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments or remarks obviate the grounds for the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23 under §112 is respectfully requested.

B. The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 8-9, 13-14, 16 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,969,696 to Stoye and Applicants' Allegedly Admitted Prior Art (hereafter "AAAPA"). The Office Action further rejects claims 3-4, 7, 10, 15 and 17 under §103(a) over Stoye and U.S. Patent No. 5,854,617 to Lee et al.

(hereafter "Lee"). Finally, the Office Action rejects claims 5-6 and 11-12 under §103(a) over Stoye, Lee and U.S. Patent No. 5,844,540 to Terasaki. Since the applied references, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest recited features in the pending claims, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

1.) Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye discloses the need for an external port capable of driving different types of displays. See column 1, lines 27-28 of Stoye. Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye discloses a portable computer system 20 can be connected through the external port to several different types of display systems 21, 22 and 23 that each have an interface board 51 and hinge connector 60 that allows the viewing angle of the display screen 70 to be adjusted relative to the portable computer system 20. The different display systems 21, 22, 23 may require different types of image information (e.g., color or monochrome) or video information. See column 2, lines 44-62 and column 4, lines 34-35 of Stoye. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye teaches to provide only power signals (5V, 12V and GND) from the computer system 20 in monitor interface 50. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that each display system 21, 22 and 23 includes a corresponding power supply, which are different, to provide power for its display screen (e.g., display screen 70). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye does not teach or suggest a computer system that includes at least features of an equipped inverter to provide driving currents for each installed vendor type of a plurality of display types, brightness control means and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

Further, Stoye discloses the monitor interface 50 includes a set of sense signals 53 that identify a display system, a set of programmable signals 52, miscellaneous signals 56, and power signals 54 and ground signals 55 that supply the display systems 21, 22 and 23

Reply to Office Action of May 1, 2006

with power (e.g., 5V, 12V and GND) to drive the display and the backlighting. See column 2, lines 30-34, 63-65 and Figures 2-3a of Stoye. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye does not teach or suggest at least features of a computer system including an equipped inverter configured to provide driving currents for each installed vendor display type of a plurality of display types and brightness control means for matching brightness control information corresponding to the vendor display type of the installed display among preset brightness control information for each of the plurality of display types and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1. See Figures 1-3b and column 2, lines 6-67 of Stoye. In contrast, Stoye discloses providing only the identical power signals 54 and ground signals 55 (5V, 12V and GND) to drive the display and the backlighting of the display systems 21, 22 and 23. See column 2, lines 63-65 of Stoye.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye does not teach or suggest at least a problem whereby a single driving current can provide a different brightness level for each of a plurality of displays or display types (e.g., vendor display types) that can be installed in a computer system for use with an equipped inverter. Stoye merely discloses different display systems 21, 22, 23 may require different types of image information (e.g., color or monochrome) or video information. See column 2, lines 51-55 of Stoye. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye does not teach or suggest any modification to its disclosure that would result in at least features of an equipped inverter, brightness control means and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

2.) The Office Action admits that Stoye does not teach or suggest an inverter for providing current to control the brightness of the display, but asserts that AAAPA discloses the same. See Item 4, lines 11-18 of page 3 of the May 1, 2006 Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that AAAPA merely discloses providing one set of driving currents from an inverter, even when such an inverter provides driving currents to a plurality of different types of vendor LCDs that can be respectively installed in a computer system. See paragraphs 4-6 of AAAPA. Further, AAAPA does not teach or suggest at least a problem whereby a single driving current can provide a different brightness level for each of a plurality of displays or display types (e.g., vendor display types) that can be installed in a computer system for use with an equipped inverter. See paragraphs 4-6 of AAAPA. Thus, AAAPA does not teach or suggest at least features of computer system including an equipped inverter configured to provide driving currents for each installed vendor display type of a plurality of display types and brightness control means for matching brightness control information corresponding to the vendor display type of the installed display among preset brightness control information for each of the plurality of display types and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

3.) As described above, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye and AAAPA, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features of a computer system including an equipped inverter configured to provide driving currents for each installed vendor display type of a plurality of display types and brightness control means and combinations thereof recited in independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Lee and Terasaki, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least features of a computer system and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1 and lacking from Stoye and AAAPA. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye, AAAPA, Lee and Terasaki, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features of a computer system including an

equipped inverter configured to provide driving currents for each installed vendor display type of a plurality of display types and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

Claim 21

4.) With respect to claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye does not teach or suggest any modification to its disclosure that would result in at least features of wherein the driving device outputs each of the driving currents corresponding to said each of the installable display types such that a brightness level of the installable display types are equally controlled and combinations thereof as recited in claim 21.

The Office Action admits that Stoye does not teach "using any specific method for control the brightness of the display" connected through an external port. See Item 4, lines 17-18 of page 3 of the May 1, 2006 Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye discloses providing only the identical power signals 54 and ground signals 55 (5V, 12V and GND) to drive the display and the backlighting of the display systems 21, 22 and 23. See column 2, lines 30-34 and 63-65 of Stoye.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that AAAPA merely discloses providing one set of driving currents from an inverter, even when such an inverter provides driving currents to a plurality of different types of vendor LCDs that can be respectively installed in a computer system. See paragraphs 4-6 of AAAPA. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye and AAAPA, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features of a computer system including a display device installed in the computer system and a driving device equipped in the computer system configured to connect with and provide driving currents to each of the plurality of installable display types, wherein the driving device outputs each of the driving currents corresponding to said each of the installable display types such that a brightness level of the installable display types are

equally controlled and combinations thereof as recited in claim 21.

Applicants respectfully submit that Lee and Terasaki, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least features of a computer system and combinations thereof as recited in claim 21 and lacking from Stoye and AAAPA. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye, AAAPA, Lee and Terasaki, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features of wherein the driving device outputs each of the driving currents corresponding to said each of the installable display types such that a brightness level of the installable display types are equally controlled and combinations thereof as recited in claim 21.

Claim 15

With respect to claim 15, as described above, the May 1, 2006 Office Action admits that Stoye does not teach or suggest an inverter for providing current to control the brightness of the display. See Item 4, lines 11-18 of page 3 of the May 1, 2006 Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye does not teach or suggest any modification to its disclosure that would result in at least features of a method including providing an inverter for outputting driving currents to a plurality of displays and controlling the brightness of the at least one display in use using the inverter based on the outputted brightness control information, wherein the inverter outputs each of the driving currents corresponding to each kind of display such that a brightness level of the kinds of displays are equally controlled and combinations thereof as recited in claim 15.

AAAPA is not applied against claims 15 and 17.

Applicants respectfully submit that Lee does not teach or suggest at least features of a method and combinations thereof as recited in claims 15 and 17, respectively, and

lacking from Stoye. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye and Lee, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features of a method including providing an inverter and controlling the brightness, wherein the inverter outputs each of the driving currents corresponding to each kind of display such that a brightness level of the kinds of displays are equally controlled and combinations thereof as recited in claim 15..

Claim 10

With respect to claim 10, the May 1, 2006 Office Action admits that Stoye does not teach “using any specific method to control brightness of a display connected through an external port. See Item 4, lines 17-18 of page 3 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye does not teach or suggest any modification to its disclosure that would result in at least features of a method for driving a plurality of displays, including determining a plurality of different prescribed brightness control informations by driving the plurality of display types using variable driving currents to respectively achieve a single set of a plurality of different brightness levels, and wherein the plurality of different prescribed brightness control informations are determined using a single inverter type and combinations thereof as recited in claim 10.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that AAAPA merely discloses providing one set of driving currents from an inverter, even when such an inverter provides driving currents to a plurality of different types of vendor LCDs that can be respectively installed in a computer system. See paragraphs 4-6 of AAAPA. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Stoye and AAAPA, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features of determining a plurality of different prescribed brightness control informations by driving the plurality of display types using variable driving currents to respectively achieve a single set of a plurality of different brightness levels, and wherein

Serial No. 10/629,542
Reply to Office Action of May 1, 2006

Docket No. HI-0160

the plurality of different prescribed brightness control informations are determined using a single inverter type and combinations thereof as recited in claim 10.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 15 and 21 respectively define patentable subject matter. Independent claims 8 and 18 define patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to claim 1. Independent claims 2 and 16 define patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to claim 21. Claims 2-7, 9-14, 17 and 19-20 depend from claims 2, 8, 16, 18 and 21, respectively, and therefore also define patentable subject matter for at least that reason as well as their additionally recited features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-23 under §103 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Carl R. Wesolowski**, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 10/629,542
Reply to Office Action of May 1, 2006

Docket No. HI-0160

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski
Registration No. 40,372

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/CRW:jld

Date: July 13, 2006
Q:\Documents\2019-156\Document in ProLaw

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610